

An Operator Formulation of Classical Mechanics and Semiclassical Limit

Slobodan Prvanović and Zvonko Marić
Institute of Physics, P.O. Box 57, 11001 Belgrade,
Serbia

February 1, 2008

Abstract

The generalized $\hbar$ -dependent operator algebra is defined ($0 \leq \hbar \leq \hbar_o$). For $\hbar = \hbar_o$ it becomes equivalent to the quantum mechanical algebra of observables and for $\hbar = 0$ it is equivalent to the classical one. We show this by proposing how the main features of both mechanics can be defined in operator form.

PACS: 03.65.Bz, 03.65.Sq

The present considerations will address a part of kinematical aspect of quantum mechanics (QM) and classical mechanics (CM) in order to investigate the correspondence principle. That is, the semiclassical limit of QM will be discussed in the algebraic framework. The dynamics will be just mentioned here. For this purpose an operator formulation of classical mechanics is proposed. It is very similar to those exposed and used in [1-4]. Our intention is to find such a formulation in which the main characteristics of QM and CM can be preserved. More precisely, for the new formulation the following should hold: 1.) the observables and states are in the 1-1 correspondence with the adequate ones of the standard formulation of QM and CM, 2.) the commutation relations among observables and the relations among the eigenstates of observables are the same as are those in the standard formulations and 3.) the mean values are not altered. The mathematical arena that will be used can be seen as a direct product of coordinate and momentum representations of QM, so it will mimic phase space formulation of CM.

Firstly, we introduce the generalized operator h -dependent algebra of observables which is defined as the algebra of polynomials in operators $\tilde{Q}$, $\tilde{P}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ (with real coefficients) that are defined as

$$\tilde{Q} = \hat{Q} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \left[\hat{R}_q + \left(1 - \frac{h}{h_o} \right) \hat{R}_p \right] + \hat{I} \otimes \hat{Q} \otimes \hat{R}_p, \quad (1)$$

$$\tilde{P} = \hat{P} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{R}_q + \hat{I} \otimes \hat{P} \otimes \left[\left(1 - \frac{h}{h_o} \right) \hat{R}_q + \hat{R}_p \right], \quad (2)$$

and $\hat{\mathcal{I}} = \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I}$. These operators act in $\mathcal{H}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}_p \otimes \mathcal{H}_r$ where q , p and r are just indices. The first two spaces are the rigged Hilbert spaces and the third is a two-dimensional Hilbert space. More concretely, $\mathcal{H}_q$ and $\mathcal{H}_p$ are formally identical to the rigged Hilbert space of states which is used in nonrelativistic QM of a single particle with the one degree of freedom when spin is neglected. The indices q and p serve only to denote that the choice of a basis in these spaces is *a priori* fixed when the semiclassical limit is under considerations. For the basis in $\mathcal{H}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}_p$ we take $|q\rangle \otimes |p\rangle$. Here $|q\rangle$ and $|p\rangle$ are the eigenvectors of $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{P}$, respectively. Then, $\mathcal{H}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}_p$ can be seen as an analogue of the phase space. The third space is introduced only for the formal reasons. The parameter h takes values from 0 to h_o , where h_o is related to QM (the nonvanishing Planck constant) while for $h = 0$ the above algebra will be related to CM. The operators $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{P}$ are as the operators representing coordinate and momentum in standard QM: they do not commute ($[\hat{Q}, \hat{P}] = i\hbar\hat{I}$), they are Hermitian, etc.

For the projectors $\hat{R}_q$ and $\hat{R}_p$ the following relations should hold: $\hat{R}_q\hat{R}_p = 0$, $\hat{R}_q\hat{R}_q = \hat{R}_q$, $\hat{R}_p\hat{R}_p = \hat{R}_p$, $\hat{R}_q^\dagger = \hat{R}_q$, $\hat{R}_p^\dagger = \hat{R}_p$ and $\hat{R}_q + \hat{R}_p = \hat{I}$. They have no physical meaning and are introduced to ensure desired properties of the polynomials in $\tilde{Q}$ and $\tilde{P}$ for the extreme values of h .

When the above algebra of operators is represented with respect to the basis $|q\rangle \otimes |p\rangle \otimes |r_i\rangle$, where $i = \{q, p\}$ and $|r_i\rangle$ is the eigenvector for $\hat{R}_i$ ($\langle r_i | r_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$), for $h = h_o$, it becomes equivalent to the representation (with respect to the same basis) of

$$\hat{Q}_{qm} = \hat{Q} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{R}_q + \hat{I} \otimes \hat{Q} \otimes \hat{R}_p, \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{P}_{qm} = \hat{P} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{R}_q + \hat{I} \otimes \hat{P} \otimes \hat{R}_p. \quad (4)$$

This algebra and the appropriate eigenvectors are in the one-to-one correspondence with the standard formulation of QM (defined in a single rigged Hilbert space). For example, it holds: $[\hat{Q}_{qm}, \hat{P}_{qm}] = i\hbar\hat{\mathcal{I}}$, as it is necessary. On the other hand, due to the mentioned properties of $\hat{R}_q$ and $\hat{R}_p$, the standard representation of QM observable, e.g., $h(\hat{Q}, \hat{P})$, is now translated to

$$h(\hat{Q}_{qm}, \hat{P}_{qm}) = f(\hat{Q}, \hat{P}) \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{R}_q + \hat{I} \otimes f(\hat{Q}, \hat{P}) \otimes \hat{R}_p.$$

If $|\Psi_i\rangle$ were eigenstates of $h(\hat{Q}, \hat{P})$, then

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_i\rangle = c_q|\Psi_i\rangle \otimes |a\rangle \otimes |r_q\rangle + c_p|b\rangle \otimes |\Psi_i\rangle \otimes |r_p\rangle,$$

are eigenstates of $h(\hat{Q}_{qm}, \hat{P}_{qm})$ with the same eigenvalues if the coefficients c_q and c_p satisfy the condition $|c_q|^2 + |c_p|^2 = 1$ and if the vectors $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$, that are fixed at the beginning of all considerations being arbitrarily picked, are normalized $\langle a|a\rangle = \langle b|b\rangle = 1$. The mean values and all the relations among eigenstates of the same or different observables are as in the standard formulation of QM (which can be easily seen).

On the other hand, for the above representation of $\tilde{Q}$ and $\tilde{P}$, but for $\hbar = 0$, the algebra becomes equivalent to the representation of

$$\hat{Q}_{cm} = \hat{Q} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I}, \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{P}_{cm} = \hat{I} \otimes \hat{P} \otimes \hat{I}. \quad (6)$$

This algebra and the appropriate eigenstates are in the 1-1 correspondence with the standard formulation of CM (defined in the phase space). Namely, to the c -number formulation of a CM observable, e.g., $h(q, p)$, now corresponds $h(\hat{Q}_{cm}, \hat{P}_{cm}) = h(\hat{Q} \otimes \hat{I}, \hat{I} \otimes \hat{P}) \otimes \hat{I}$. Such an algebra is manifestly a commutative one. The vectors $|q_o\rangle \otimes |p_o\rangle \otimes (c_q|r_q\rangle + c_p|r_p\rangle)$ are eigenstates of all CM observables (with the eigenvalues $h(q_o, p_o)$). These vectors are the analogs of the points in phase space for a CM system with one degree of freedom. For these pure states it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & |q_o\rangle\langle q_o| \otimes |p_o\rangle\langle p_o| \otimes (c_q|r_q\rangle + c_p|r_p\rangle)(c_q^*\langle r_q| + c_p^*\langle r_p|) = \\ & = \int \int \delta(q - q_o)\delta(p - p_o)|q\rangle\langle q| \otimes |p\rangle\langle p| dq dp \otimes (c_q|r_q\rangle + c_p|r_p\rangle)(c_q^*\langle r_q| + c_p^*\langle r_p|) = \\ & = \delta(\hat{Q} - q_o) \otimes \delta(\hat{P} - p_o) \otimes (c_q|r_q\rangle + c_p|r_p\rangle)(c_q^*\langle r_q| + c_p^*\langle r_p|). \end{aligned}$$

Guided by this, the mixed CM states now can be defined as $\rho(\hat{Q} \otimes \hat{I}, \hat{I} \otimes \hat{P}) \otimes (c_q|r_q\rangle + c_p|r_p\rangle)(c_q^*\langle r_q| + c_p^*\langle r_p|)$. All CM states will be Hermitian, non-negative operators and normalized to $\delta^2(0)$ if for $\rho(q, p)$ it holds that: $\rho(q, p) \in \mathbf{R}$, $\rho(q, p) \geq 0$ and $\int \int \rho(q, p) dq dp = 1$ as in the standard phase space formulation of CM. The mean values of both QM and CM observables are now calculated by the Ansatz: $\langle \hat{A} \rangle = Tr(\hat{\rho} \hat{A}) / Tr \hat{\rho}$, so the norm $\delta^2(0)$ does not affect anything in the proposal. This, and the fact that the phase space formulation of CM appears through the kernels of the operator formulation in the $|q\rangle \otimes |p\rangle \otimes |r_i\rangle$ representation, can be used as the proof of equivalence of these two formulations.

There will be a complete correspondence between the c -number formulation and the above given operator formulation of CM if the dynamical equation is defined as the Liouville equation, where the partial derivations within the Poisson bracket are done with respect to the operators $\hat{Q}_{cm}$ and $\hat{P}_{cm}$. The dynamical equation of QM representatives should be the Schrödinger (von Neumann) equation as it is in the standard formulation of QM.

The Hamilton function $h(q, p)$ of CM and the Hamiltonian $h(\hat{Q}, \hat{P})$ of QM (if they are addressing the same physical system, for example the harmonic oscillator) are represented here by $h(\hat{Q}_{cm}, \hat{P}_{cm})$ and $h(\hat{Q}_{qm}, \hat{P}_{qm})$, respectively. The last two operators follow from $h(\hat{Q}, \hat{P})$ for $h = 0$ and $h = h_o$. (It is understood that one should work in $|q\rangle \otimes |p\rangle \otimes |r_i\rangle$ representation. This we have not proceeded here only for the sake of simplicity of expressions.) Therefore, the semiclassical limit of QM (or the correspondence principle to be more accurate) can be established through the generalized operator algebra, since for the one extreme value of h it expresses QM properties while for the other value of h it has CM ones. This holds for each polynomial with real coefficients in coordinate and momentum no matter of how these operators are ordered. (The ordering problem we shall discuss elsewhere.) The states are seen as secondary in the present proposal. That is, the meaningful states are solutions of the appropriate eigenvalue problems and, because QM and CM observables are essentially different, they differ, too. At this place it should be remarked that since the purpose of the introduced framework was to discuss the semiclassical limit of QM without altering the most important features of both mechanics, it was necessary to take $\mathcal{H}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}_p \otimes \mathcal{H}_r$ which is much wider than $\mathcal{H}$, where quantum mechanics is irreducibly represented. Only a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}_p \otimes \mathcal{H}_r$, that is formed over the basis $|\tilde{\Psi}_i\rangle$, has the QM interpretation. It depends on the choice of $|a\rangle$, $|b\rangle$, c_q and c_p which,

after being initially fixed, give the irreducible representation of QM.

1. T.N. Sherry and E.C.G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. D **18** 4580 (1978).
2. T.N. Sherry and E.C.G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. D **20** 857 (1979).
3. S.R. Gautam *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **20** 3081 (1979).
4. S. Prvanović and Z. Marić, Toward the collapse of state, quant-ph/9910020, submitted for publication in Phys. Rev. A